

## **REMARKS**

Applicants' representative would like to thank Examiner Dunn for the courtesies extended during an interview conducted on October 21, 2009. During the interview, Applicants' representative requested clarification of the rejection of the Declaration filed on August 1, 2008, under 35 U.S.C. § 251. The Examiner explained that the Declaration must list every amendment and, further, that the Declaration filed on August 1, 2008, failed to sufficiently specify at least one error upon which the reissue is based. The Examiner directed Applicants' representative to MPEP § 1414(II)(B, C) for further guidance. No agreements were reached with respect to patentability. Furthermore, no exhibits were shown or demonstrations conducted.

Claims 1-7, 9-29, 71, 75-95, 97, 99-102, 104-106, and 108-120 are now pending in the application. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

### **35 U.S.C. § 251**

Claims 1-7, 9-29, 71, 75-95, 97, 99-102, 104-106, and 108-120 stand rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. § 251. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the Reissue Declaration filed on August 1, 2008, failed to list the amendments filed on August 1, 2008, and on December 29, 2008. The Examiner also asserts that the Reissue Declaration filed on August 1, 2008, fails to sufficiently

specify at least one error upon which the reissue is based. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit herewith a Reissue Application Declaration by the Inventor (PTO/SB/51), which identifies each amendment made in the subject patent application, including the amendments filed August 1, 2008, and December 23, 2008. In addition, the Declaration filed herewith now recites that independent Claim 31, as issued, is too narrow, as independent Claim 31 recites a “first fluid operated piston” at line 25. Applicants respectfully submit that the Reissue Declaration filed herewith is in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 251 and 37 CFR § 1.175 and, as such, respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 22, 2009

By: /Matthew H. Szalach/  
Michael Malinzak, Reg. 43,770  
Matthew H. Szalach, Reg. 53,665

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MM/MHS/ca

14742262.1